

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 48-52 and 57-68, the only claims pending and currently under Examination in this application.

In the above amendments, Claim 48 has been amended to further define the invention. Support for this amendment can be found for example on p. 6, lines 10-11, and p. 8, lines 10-12. Claim 66 has been amended to further define the invention. Support for this amendment can be found on p. 7, lines 29-30, and p. 9, lines 1-2. Claim 67 has been amended to further define the invention. Support for this amendment can be found for example on p. 8, lines 3-4 and lines 10-12. The dependency of dependent Claim 58 has been amended in view of withdrawn Claims 54 and 56. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

As no new matter has been added by way of these amendments, entry thereof by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 48, 49, 52, 57-63, and 66-68 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Edwards et al. (U.S. 6,163,716).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

An element of the claims is the presence of at least two separately identifiable effectors wherein each effector comprises a transducer and an identifiable

processor, wherein the effectors are electrically coupled to at least one electrical conductor.

Edwards does not anticipate the Applicant's invention because Edwards does not disclose this element. Rather, the method in Edwards discloses separate data conductors 126 (input) and 128 (output) for each processor (microprocessor chip 106) as shown in Figs. 20, and 22-24 below: